

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 19, 27 and 31 have been amended. Claims 1 – 31 are currently pending.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 – 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Petropoulos, *et al.*, U.S. Publn. No. 2003/0146939 A1 (hereinafter “Petropoulos”). Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 19, 27 and 31 in response to this rejection. Claims 1, 27 and 31 now require a preview utility “configured to provide preview displays for items stored in accordance with a plurality of file formats, wherein said preview utility identifies a file format associated with said set of data and utilizes said file format to choose a content selection algorithm” that selects the actual content displayed by the preview display. Similarly, independent claim 19, as amended, now requires “identifying a file format associated with said set of data; utilizing said file format to choose a content selection algorithm, wherein said content selection algorithm is associated with said file format.” Applicants respectfully submit that Petropoulos does not teach these aspects of amended independent claims 1, 19, 27 and 31.

Petropoulos addresses the “challenges of analyzing the results of a database query or Internet or intranet search.” Petropoulos, para. 10. The system of Petropoulos displays preview information associated with each item on a list of search query results. *Id.* The preview information is displayed in a “preview window” and includes content such as “a readable size image of the actual page or document associated with an item in the results list.” *Id.* By teaching such a preview display, Petropoulos purports to provide an improved interface for displaying search query results.

Petropoulos teaches two different techniques for selecting the content to be displayed in the preview area. Petropoulos “allows for the type of preview information to be fixed or user-programmable.” Petropoulos, para 33. For fixed-type preview information, the same information is always displayed for a particular page. *Id.* For programmable-type information, “a user or programmer may decide what type of preview information is displayed,” and these content decisions may be embodied in a configuration file. *Id.*

While Petropoulos provides different techniques for selecting preview area content, Petropoulos is silent as to providing a utility configured to vary the preview display based on the file format of the to-be-previewed data. Though Petropoulos contemplates allowing a content provider or a user to control the content placed in a display, Petropoulos does not teach varying the algorithm used in the selection of preview content based on the file format of the data. Moreover, Petropoulos is directed to previewing search query results, not to a utility for providing previews of various files having different file-formats. As such, Petropoulos does not teach a preview utility “configured to provide preview displays for items stored in accordance with a plurality of file formats, wherein said preview utility identifies a file format associated with said set of data and utilizes said file format to choose a content selection algorithm” that selects said actual content displayed by said preview display, as required by the amended independent claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 19, 27 and 31 are in condition for allowance.


Applicants also submit that dependent claims 2 - 18, which depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Further, Applicants submit that dependent claims 20 - 26, which depend from claim 19, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 19.

Applicants also submit that dependent claims 28 - 30, which depend from claim 27, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 27.

Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, claims 1 – 31 are now in condition for allowance. If any issues remain which would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned prior to issuing a subsequent action. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional amount required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert H. Reckers
Reg. No. 54,633

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, Missouri 64108-2613
Phone: 816/474-6550
Fax: 816-421-5547